

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES

NOVEMBER 6, 2014

AGENDA

- 1. Deer Run PUD, Subarea C - Cortona
14-062FDP/FP
(Approved 7 - 0)**

**Dublin Road and Memorial Drive
Final Development Plan/Final Plat**

The Chair, Chris Amorose Groomes, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Other Commission members present were, Richard Taylor, Amy Kramb, John Hardt, Victoria Newell, Todd Zimmerman, and City Council Representative Amy Salay. City representatives present were Phil Hartmann, Steve Langworthy, Jennifer Rauch, Marie Downie, Alan Perkins, and Flora Rogers.

Administrative Business

Motion and Vote

Ms. Salay moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to accept the documents into the record. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Salay, yes. (Approved 7 – 0)

Motion and Vote

Ms. Kramb had submitted amendments to the October 2, 2014 meeting minutes prior to the meeting.

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to approve the October 2, 2014 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hardt, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Taylor, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Ms. Newell, yes. (Approved 7 – 0.)

Ms. Amorose Groomes briefly explained the rules and procedures of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

- 1. Deer Run PUD, Subarea C - Cortona
14-062FDP/FP**

**Dublin Road and Memorial Drive
Final Development Plan/Final Plat**

Chair Amorose Groomes said the following application is a previously tabled case and is a request to plat and develop 37 single-family, cluster lots with 7.3 acres of open space and associated site improvements for Subarea C within the Deer Run Planned Unit Development, at the northeast corner of the intersection of Dublin Road and Memorial Drive. She said two motions are required, one for the final plat and one for the final development plan. She said the Commission will forward their recommendation to City Council for the final plat and is the final authority on the final development plan, for which we will need to swear-in anyone intending to address the Commission on this case.

Chair Amorose Groomes swore in those intending to address the Commission.

Marie Downie presented this application for final development plan and final plat for Deer Run Subarea C. She said City Council and Planning and Zoning Commission approved the rezoning and the preliminary plans for the entire Deer Run Subdivision in 2011. She said this is Subarea C located at the corner of

Dublin Road and Memorial Drive. She said the application was tabled at the September 18, 2014 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting where the Commission had concerns about the quality of architecture, lot sizes as well as the drive way locations along the entry drive.

Ms. Downie said the proposal includes 37 single-family lots that are clustered behind tree preservation reserves along Memorial Drive and Dublin Road. She said it includes 7.3 acres of open space with private drives throughout the Subarea and access through Sapri Boulevard off of Memorial Drive.

Ms. Downie said due to concerns from the Commission regarding the driveways for lots 1 and 37 the applicant has made revisions to the landscape island along the entry boulevard and added a note to the plat indicating that the driveways for these lots must be off Pesaro Way.

Ms. Downie said the development text has specific requirements for each lot with lots 19 and 33 not meeting the minimum 120-foot lot depth. She said the Commission expressed concerns at the September 18th meeting with allowing these lots to be smaller than what is permitted by the text and had asked the applicant to explore the options of expanding these lots. She said the previous proposal included four lots that did not meet these requirements, however two have since been removed. She said the applicant has considered expanding the two lots to meet the requirements however has determined that doing so would result in significant impacts to the nature of the development. She said Planning recommends the houses for lots 19 and 33 be located as close as possible into the zero to 10-foot build zone and a small model be used on these lots which will allow for maximum usable outdoor space. She said the proposed lot layouts are developable and provide adequate space, Planning recommends approval of this minor text modification.

Ms. Downie said an architecture appendix was referenced in the development text. She said the text provides specific requirements that were approved by the Commission as well as City Council, while the appendix is a document that provides illustrative guidance to the architectural style. She said the applicant has provided updated conceptual elevations to show how they meet the intent of the style and the requirements specified in the development text. She said the development text requires front facades with a minimum of 20 percent to be stone or brick. She said when sides or rear facades are visible from the street, oriented toward the street or are visible from a neighboring lot, they require the amount of brick and stone to be proportional to the amount use on the front façade. She said the applicant has agreed to provide brick or stone on 40 percent of all facades on lots 1, 12, 19, 33, and 37 that are visible or oriented towards a private drive. She said all of these lots are corner lots.

Ms. Downie said Sapri Boulevard remains the only entrance into the subarea and the gate is consistent with the previous proposal with 5 decorative 6-foot tall columns. She said 3 of the columns are incorporated within the gate and the remaining two are closer to Memorial Drive with each including 1.8-square-foot signs. She said Planning requests the applicant provide additional landscaping around the service structures located at the entry.

Ms. Downie said the final plat is consistent with the final development plan and includes a note regarding the driveway access for lots 1 and 37.

Ms. Downie said there is a minor text modification requested to permit lots 19 and 33 to have lot sizes that are smaller than permitted by the development text and these lots will be as shown in the final development plan. She said Planning is recommending approval of the minor text modification with the conditions included in the final development plan because the sample lot configurations show that the lots have adequate space for the homes while providing usable outdoor space.

Ms. Downie said the applicant is meeting the criteria for the final development plan and planning is recommending approval of the final development plan with 6 conditions as outlined in the planning report.

Ms. Downie said the applicant is meeting all the necessary criteria for the final plat with the one condition included.

Tom Hart, representing Romanelli & Hughes, said he wanted to clarify lots 19 and 33 do not meet the lot depth requirements. Ms. Downie agreed.

Mr. Hart said they heard the concerns about the corner lots with the greatest visibility and they tried to come up with a solution. He said they agreed to increase the brick and stone architectural detail on the three sides that face the public view or the private streets to try to meet the concerns.

Mr. Hart said they did look at shrinking surrounding lots and moving lot lines, but the impact with doing so is difficult and would shrink 6 other lots which was too great of an impact on the balance of the site. He said they have 32 reservations for lots within the community and explaining the lot changes was not something they could make sense with the market information.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were anyone from the general public that would like to make comment with respect to this case. [There were none.]

Mr. Hardt thanked the applicant for the changes they have made especially with the driveways along the entry boulevard as well as fixing the two lots not meeting the size requirements. He asked for more explanations to the lots 19 and 33 and the impacts to the other lots.

Mr. Hart said these corner lots are consistent with an approved preliminary plat and they have laid out the easements, utilities and site improvements accordingly. He said to lengthen the lot line on lot 19 along Lucera Loop they have to adjust all 6 lots around that loop from 65 foot to 60 foot widths.

Jeff Strung, EMH&T, 5500 New Albany Road, Columbus, Ohio, said the one lot line that is not adjacent to the road right-of-way meets or exceeds the depth requirement, but the lot line along the private drive is substantially less due to the angle of the lots. He said in order to accomplish the required depth they have to modify 6 lots by 5 feet and even with the reduction they may not make the minimum requirement of 120 feet at the private road right-of-way. He said they are working with the approved zoning text and preliminary development plan approved by the Commission and City Council that are not in compliance with each other. He said the approved preliminary site plan does not meet the requirement in that location. He said in order for lot 33 to meet the depth requirement they would have to take out 10 feet from lots 34 – 36 which are already at the minimum requirements.

Mr. Hardt said they have a couple of lots with smaller dimensions than the approved text permits and they are off by about 30 feet which is a big deviation. Mr. Strung said the median depths are substantially greater than it is at the right-of-way or private road.

Mr. Hardt said he thinks it is problematic if they back off the lot dimensions that Council and the Commission thought they were getting.

Mike Close, 7360 Bellaire, said he understands but there was a discussion three years ago in conjunction with the discussion about sidewalks. He said when they looked at the drawings they knew there would be trouble with sizes on a couple lots and it was known by the Commission when they approved the plan. He said they have come back consistently with the drawings and minimized to the extent they can. He said by putting smaller houses on these two lots they have diminished the impact and there is really no reason to do that particularly when they approved this knowing that would be an issue when they returned with the final plan.

Mr. Hardt said he had no idea that this would have been an issue or he would not have supported it three years ago.

Mr. Hardt asked if the service structure was being installed in a pit. Mr. Strung said it is in a pit with 18 inches above the grade.

Mr. Hardt asked if the gates at the entry were operable or decorative. Mr. Strung said they are operable and if someone does not wish to enter they can exit through the cut in the median.

Mr. Hardt said across the street from lots 36 and 37 there is a deviation in the width of the street and asked if it is intended to be on-street parking and if it is wide enough. Mr. Strung said there is parallel parking in several locations as well as along Lucera Loop with the street width designed according to development standards as reviewed by the City Engineer.

Ms. Downie said Engineering has approved the space provided along the parallel parking areas.

Ms. Salay said that the plat needs to note the county information for the properties that straddle the county line to inform the buyer of the appropriate county for the residence. Mr. Close said that there is a procedure that has been developed by the County Auditors to assign the appropriate county for properties that have dual counties on a parcel.

Ms. Salay said she is concerned stucco does not age well and she would like to see more stone on the front façade.

Mr. Hart said the homeowners have the final decision in how the houses are designed and the detailing and decisions are made with the builder will change the details of the houses than are shown in elevation examples. He said the builder has asked to not forget the customers input and role in the process and would ask for some consideration in the options and choices available to the home buyer.

Ms. Newell said because of the closeness of the houses on the lots 33, 19 and 1 the perception is that it will not be attractive when built on those lots. She said the architectural details of chimneys are not in the sketches and was disappointed that there was no details and creativity for the use of stone within the elevations. She said she would like to see changes in the type and use of stone and not just flat stone across elevations.

Ms. Kramb said they are clearing out the trees across the development and the text does not mention the tree waiver and asked for an explanation. Ms. Downie said the development text includes the language included the approved waiver.

Ms. Kramb said the development text indicates trees 6 to 18 inches will be replaced tree for tree and if it is over 18 inches it will be replaced inch for inch. Ms. Rauch said the waiver was approved by City Council and the plans indicated the number of trees replaced on-site and the remainder paid as a fee in lieu.

Mr. Hardt said one of the conditions is the fee be paid before the first building permit is issued. Mr. Close said they have agreed to pay the fee prior to that application.

Ms. Kramb asked if lot 1 met the 70 percent lot coverage requirement because the grass left seems to be only the 30 feet in the back yard.

Ms. Rauch said that requirement will be handled with the building permit. She said the example shows how the lot layout would be developed, but the requirements would have to be met at permit review.

Mr. Hart said they tried to give illustrations based on the work with staff to show relatively large homes that could fit on a lot to show their largest options could fit.

Ms. Kramb said there is still too much plain face and stucco on the designs.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if lots 19 and 33 had enough room to install a patio. Mr. Hart confirmed lots 19 and 33 had enough outdoor usable space.

Mr. Taylor thanked the applicant for the additional work that they have done on the elevations because they are much better and getting a lot closer to getting some buildings as examples that can be approved. He said his concern with getting this right is because in developments like this, the first house is always the best house. He said there will be a design review process that by the text will be a membership of the association and there are no residents as of yet which will end up being the developer becomes the design review board.

Mr. Taylor said he had a discussion with the Assistant City Attorney regarding Appendix 1 and it was confirmed that when the development text is reviewed they are also reviewing Appendix 1 and while the applicant is not held to the specific details it is intended to be the guideline that is use to make sure the houses are meeting the development text. He said there are a number of things that need to be addressed to be as good as it can be so there is a good starting point.

Mr. Taylor said the six examples seem to be a French Country derivative and asked if that is intended for the entire neighborhood.

Steve Jones, 5545 Harlem Road, Galena, Ohio, said they will lean heavily to the one style with variations.

Mr. Taylor said it is one that gives a lot of opportunities and design freedom. He said all the examples tend to be fewer major materials on the house and seemed like a few had too many materials and one or two materials should dominate. He said the example that he was specifically referring to was the rear of Corner Model 6 where there is siding, stucco, brick trim, stone, copper, and asphalt. He said they will do better to eliminate a couple of the materials on that model.

Mr. Taylor said garage roofs shown in Appendix 1 have the plate heights drop down from the house and there is a gap of space between the top of the garage windows and the bottom of the roof. He said on the hip examples it would be a good thing to do because it would eliminate the gap of stone at the top that is out of proportion and would lower the presence of the house closest to the street.

Mr. Taylor said some have a flared roof detail which is a nice detail, but on a couple it looked a little too much, particularly in Model 2. He suggested having an accent on some of the main roof areas but not necessarily going all the way around the house. He said that simplicity in the details was an encouraged element and this is something that is more complex than it needs to be.

Mr. Taylor said the windows are clustered together nicely in Model 2 with the arch and shutters, but looks incomplete on Model 6 and 1 where the windows are spread apart at odd distances He said bringing the windows together might be a better look.

Mr. Taylor said there are a couple of places on the houses where the window proportions are dramatically different than in other places. He said it would be better in some places to structure the windows vertically and continue to accentuate that. He said that particularly on the front of Model 1 the upper windows could have a more vertical proportion and it would look better in that position.

Mr. Taylor asked if the materials of the windows would be clad or something else. Mr. Jones said the windows would be clad.

Mr. Taylor said it is mentioned prominent muttons on the windows. Mr. Jones said they would be snap in's.

Mr. Taylor said asked if they would be the same color of the window frames. Mr. Jones said they will match the window frames.

Mr. Taylor asked for the garage door materials if it is known yet what they are doing. Mr. Jones said it is a simulated wood, fiberglass composite.

Mr. Taylor asked if they are doing a carriage style door. Mr. Jones agreed.

Mr. Taylor said the text mentions conductor heads for downspouts and wanted to make the point that with houses like these with broken up roofs there will be a lot of gutters and downspouts and the placement of the conductor heads and downspouts is going to have a big visual impact on the front of the house and typically on the cottage style there will be a big deal out of the conductor head and make it an architectural element, so he would like to see them addressed.

Mr. Taylor asked if the chimney on the front of Model 1 would be gas fire place. Mr. Jones said it would be a gas fireplace. Mr. Taylor asked if there would be a big stainless steel vent on the front of the chimney. Mr. Jones said if there is a chimney it will be vented out of the top and there will not be a vent on the front.

Mr. Taylor said the firebox would be up taller and if it will have an actual flue then the Code requires that it be 2 feet taller than the nearest roof within 10 feet, so it will be about 4 feet taller. Mr. Jones said it would only be the case if it is a wood burning flue and most clients do not want to deal with burning wood.

Mr. Taylor said if there is a chimney there it will have to still meet the requirement and if it is going to be a gas fireplace with a flue there is going to be a cap at the top and the Code suggests chimney pots that are difficult to do with a wood frame chimney. He said that a lot of the houses in the examples have a really nice shroud around them and that is something that should be shown because it adds height and has a big impact.

Mr. Taylor said when prominent on the front these styles make a big deal out of the chimney and has a really strong architectural element, so there is a lot of pattern of masonry and carving in and out. He recommended that if there is going to be a chimney in the front of Model 1 and Model 7 to make a big deal out of it architecturally so it becomes an element and doesn't look like an afterthought.

Mr. Taylor said the text talks about 4-sided architecture and the side elevations of the important lots that they have worked on have done a good job of giving those something very similar to the front. He said he wants to make sure that the only thing that is carried from the front to the side is not just the materials and that there are places where they can use a dormer or a different window grouping or something that looks like they paid some attention to it rather than just putting the windows where they are required on the inside. He said the left elevation of Model 1 could use some detailing.

Mr. Taylor said the other thing is they like to see the material change happen in a logical location and for the most part it does although there are a couple places where there is a four-inch offset in the wall. He pointed out that the left elevation of Model 1 is there is no change in the roof so it seems like the wall gets thicker to accommodate the stone.

Mr. Taylor said Model 2 on the front the windows in the dormer the upper right need to have a more vertical orientation or adjust the dormer size so that there is less space below the window. He said on the left elevation of Model 2 they have a half round colonial window which needs to be changed to something else. He said he had the same reaction to Model 7 in the rear with the eyebrow dormer which is nice but the grid pattern is very colonial and does not go with the style. He said also on Model 7 garage with there is no delineation on the front of where the two gables change and is overly complex

for that. He said the roofs they did on top of Model 1 and Model 6 work better because it is simple and covers the roof on the garage.

Mr. Taylor said there was a picture of the sign in the front and asked to clarify the name. Mr. Jones said it will be Cortona along Memorial Drive.

Mr. Taylor said if they can pick up some of these details and do one more round of revisions, he will be good with it. He thanked the applicant.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she is interested in protecting the adjacent property owners and agrees with the fellow Commissioners that 40 percent on the frontage is low and that the number should be increased. She said the threshold should be set higher and would not impede on their creativity but will provide a lot of protection in terms of quality.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she would like to see the top portions of the landscape walls at the entry feature remain level regardless of any grade changes. She said the light fixtures were custom made and wants to make sure they are identical to the existing. She said it is important that the landscape walls are mortar throughout and asked to add that detail to the landscape plans.

Mr. Hardt said he agrees with Mr. Taylor comments regarding architecture.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she agreed with Mr. Taylor's comments regarding the over use of materials on Corner Model 6

Mr. Close said they have heard the comments regarding the details and knows that their money is not the Commission's problem. He said he has been an opponent of the "No contact with the Zoning Commission Rule" for years because it slows down and interferes with a good process. He said if they could have sat down with Mr. Taylor and Mr. Hardt a month ago this would have been done today. He said the details are intended to be done as part of the process. He said he accepts the conditions as staff has indicated and that they will agree to take the recommendations made with the architecture except exceeding the 40 percent materials subject to approval by Mr. Taylor.

Vince Romanelli, 148 Schrock Road, said he has been doing this for 45 years and he agrees with the architectural details and will get plans back to the Commission and ask for approval tonight with the agreement to work with staff and the Commission to get a resolution of the plans.

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked for guidance from Mr. Hartmann. Mr. Hartmann said the policy is the applications are not split.

Ms. Rauch said City Council only sees the final plat and the Commission could vote on the final plat and forward it to City Council and continue the review of the final development plan at the Commission's next meeting which is prior to the next City Council meeting. Mr. Hartmann agreed.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said the Commission would waive the 15-day requirements for the final development plan to come back on December 4th, if needed.

Motion and Vote #1

Mr. Taylor moved, Ms. Kramb seconded, to approve the final plat with one condition that the applicant ensures that any minor technical adjustments to the plat are made prior to City Council submittal.

Mr. Close agreed to the condition.

The vote was as follows: Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Salay, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Mr. Hardt, no; Ms. Kramb, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Approved 6 – 1)

Motion and Vote #2

Mr. Taylor moved, Mr. Zimmerman seconded, to table this final development plan and the minor development text modification. The vote was as follows: Ms. Salay, yes; Ms. Newell, yes; Ms. Amorose Groomes, yes; Ms. Kramb, yes; Mr. Hardt, yes; Mr. Zimmerman, yes; and Mr. Taylor, yes. (Tabled 7 – 0)

Communications

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any communications to be relayed and discussed.

Ms. Salay said she was in the Council planning room and found the Bridge Street District Transportation Planning Study that was received June 2, 2014. She said within the study there is an executive summary regarding traffic within the Bridge Street District. She invited the Commission to review the study and said she would arrange for the Commission to have a copy of the executive summary.

Ms. Rauch said the executive summary was emailed in August by the City Manager's office to the Commission. She said the study and the summary would be put in Dropbox in the Bridge Street District Transportation folder for the Commission.

Ms. Salay said there was an article in the Columbus Dispatch about the discussion held the night before for the Insight 2050 and asked if any staff members made it to the meeting. Ms. Salay said it was an interesting article and it was emailed to the commission. Ms. Rauch said Rachel Ray did attend that meeting.

Commission Roundtable Discussion

Ms. Amorose Groomes asked if there were any roundtable issues to be discussed.

Mr. Hardt said the ART agenda meeting listed a request for a mass excavation of a site as a minor project review. He asked how this project could receive review and approval without the larger project receiving review and approval through the Bridge Street District process. Ms. Salay and Ms. Kramb asked what the project involved.

Mr. Langworthy said the owner wanted to begin to work on stock piling and pad areas as part of the mass excavation, which is normally a site permit is done exclusively through Engineering and Building Standards. He said it was decided a minor project review by the ART would be appropriate.

Mr. Hardt said it was his experience developers could not get approval to move dirt or a site permit until after a project had cleared the zoning process.

Mr. Langworthy said Planning does not normally see these projects, as it is an Engineering process that is handled through their review process.

Mr. Taylor said preparing the pads for the buildings is assuming the underground parking garages are no longer part of the plan. Mr. Langworthy said the underground parking garages have been removed from the plan.

Mr. Taylor said underground parking garages outlined are part of our Community Plan for the area and includes a statement and a picture stating terrace underground parking garages would allow buildings on top to have better views of the river. He said he wonders how this part of the Community Plan is removed without any discussion.

Mr. Langworthy said the Community Plan states this as an allowance and not a requirement. He said it is a guideline and not the law.

Mr. Taylor said this is a requirement that is considered and they have not had the opportunity to review and consider that change within the Community Plan. Mr. Langworthy said they cannot use the Community Plan to require the applicant to construct underground parking.

Ms. Salay asked if the applicant has filed revised applications regarding changes to the approved preliminary plat. Mr. Langworthy said the applicant has resubmitted the preliminary plat due to the change from private to public streets.

Mr. Hardt said he was concerned a piece of a large project was being peeled off and called minor.

Ms. Kramb said she hopes the developer is not being encouraged to start moving dirt with the plans to come back and claim hardship with money spent on moving dirt.

Ms. Salay asked for an email to clarify so they understand the process.

Ms. Newell said she has thought about the quality and quantity of the residential housing within the Bridge Street District. She said she thought the Code could use percentages or goals of how much commercial, mixed use retail and office spaces would be permitted. She said the Code needs to regulate the amount of residential to ensure the retail, commercial, and mixed use is developed.

Ms. Salay said it was a great suggestion and is interested in everyone's best ideas to get mixed use.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said she tried to put together numbers limiting units within a particular building and questioned whether they should be looking at ratios.

Ms. Kramb said they have to be willing to say no and wait for commercial development before allowing the residential.

Ms. Amorose Groomes said in the Arena District the addition of the arena, concert venues, and ball park now create enough activity to make the residential worthwhile.

Mr. Hardt said there are two ways to look at it: you say it cannot be developed until this occurs or it is incentivized to include the commercial development.

Ms. Kramb said she thought there was enough residences surrounding this area that if they put good restaurants or local services people are going to use it.

Ms. Salay said there is a balance and they are trying to find it and it's a work in progress.

Ms. Newell said these issues happened within Historic Dublin and if there isn't enough shops or individual businesses in the area to feed off each other they will not survive.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

As approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission on December 4, 2014.